

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action mailed November 16, 2007. The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the helpful telephone conference of February 11, 2008 in which the distinctions between the cited art and the present invention were discussed.

In Paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner noted the review and acceptance of the terminal disclaimer filed on 29 June 2006. Applicant acknowledges this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In Paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 9-10, and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102©) as anticipated by Anderson *et al.*, US patent 6,999,595. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Regarding Claims 1-2 and 13, the Examiner notes that Anderson *et al.* discloses a flat panel monitor frame having some components similar to those of the present application. Anderson *et al.* teach at column 2, lines 1-7 a frame that slides over the bezel of a flat panel monitor of a computer system and *is supported by the monitor*. This is clearly illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 of the Drawing. Anderson *et al.* neither teaches nor suggests a frame *which supports the monitor*. Applicant therefore believes that Anderson *et al.* does not anticipate the present invention, in which the frame is independently mounted to a surface and surrounds a flat panel monitor which itself may be either mounted to the same surface or the frame itself.

Regarding Claim 1, Applicant discloses in Specification Paragraph 0004 a flat panel monitor frame which is wall mountable independently of the flat panel monitor. Claim 1 is herein amended to make this feature explicit, and now recites:

A flat panel monitor frame, comprising:
a plurality of frame sections suitable for bordering a flat panel monitor, the frame sections comprising: a frame top; a frame right side extending downward from the frame top; and a frame left side extending downward from the frame top, at least one section mountable on a wall independently of the flat panel monitor;
at least one speaker residing in at least one of the frame sections; and
a conductor for electrically coupling the at least one speaker to a source of at least one speaker signal associated with the flat panel monitor.

Applicant respectfully believes that the presently claimed invention is not anticipated by Anderson *et al.* Applicant requests entry of the present amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claim 1 to allowance.

Regarding Claims 2 and 13, Claims 2 and 13 further define Applicant's invention and properly depend from and are limited by Claim 1. Applicant believes Claim 1 is allowable; therefore Claims 2 and 13 are allowable by reason of this dependency. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claims 2 and 13 to allowance.

Regarding Claims 9 and 14, Claims 9 and 14 further define Applicant's invention and properly depend from and are limited by Claim 1. Applicant believes Claim 1 is allowable; therefore Claims 9 and 14 are allowable by reason of this dependency. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claims 9 and 14 to allowance.

Claim 10 is herein canceled, making this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-8 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Anderson *et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Regarding Claim 3, the subject matter of Claims 4-6 and 10 is included in amended Claim 3, which further defines Applicant's invention and properly depends from and is limited by Claim 1. Applicant believes Claim 1 is allowable; therefore Claim 3 is allowable by reason of this dependency. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claim 3 to allowance.

Claims 4-6 are canceled, making this rejection moot.

Regarding Claims 7 and 8, Claims 7 and 8 further define Applicant's invention and properly depend from and are limited by Claim 1. Applicant believes Claim 1 is allowable; therefore Claims 7 and 8 are allowable by reason of this dependency. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claims 7 and 8 to allowance.

Regarding Claims 15 and 16, Claims 15 and 16 further define Applicant's invention and properly depend from and are limited by Claim 1. Applicant believes Claim 1 is allowable; therefore Claims 15 and 16 are allowable by reason of this dependency. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claims 15 and 16 to allowance.

In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 11 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Anderson *et al.* and Porzilli *et al.*, US patent 6,628,793. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 11 is canceled, making this rejection moot.

Regarding Claim 17, Applicant respectfully believes that Porzilli *et al.* does not overcome the limitation of Anderson *et al.* discussed above in regard to Claim 1. The Examiner notes that Porzilli *et al.* teaches the inclusion of a combination of speakers in a monitor frame. Claim 17 discloses a flat panel monitor frame which is independently mountable on a wall and includes a backing board for supporting the flat panel monitor, two features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Amended Claim 17 recites:

A frame system for a flat panel monitor, comprising:

a frame including a speaker portion and a trim portion, the frame comprising:
a frame top section; a frame right side section extending downward from the frame top; and a frame left side section extending downward from the frame top, at least one section mountable on a wall;

a back support board attached to the frame, said back support board adapted for supporting the flat panel monitor;

a plurality of speakers residing in the speaker portion;

a plurality of removable and replaceable grills disposed over the speaker portion; and

a removable and replaceable trim disposed over the trim portion.

Applicant respectfully believes that the presently claimed invention is patentable over Anderson *et al.* and Porzilli *et al.* Applicant requests entry of the present amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claim 17 to allowance.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Anderson *et al.* and the prior art of Anderson *et al.* Applicant respectfully

traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 12 further defines Applicant's invention and properly depends from and is limited by Claim 1. Applicant believes Claim 1 is allowable; therefore Claim 12 is allowable by reason of this dependency. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claim 12 to allowance.

Regarding Claim 18, Applicant respectfully repeats the discussion herein above regarding Claims 1 and 17. Applicant respectfully believes that Claim 18 is not made obvious by the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and is therefore allowable. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claim 18 to allowance.

Regarding Claim 19, Claim 19 further defines Applicant's invention and properly depends from and is limited by Claim 18. Applicant believes Claim 18 is allowable; therefore Claim 19 is allowable by reason of this dependency. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment, favorable consideration of these remarks, withdrawal of this rejection, and passage of Claim 19 to allowance.

New Claims

New Claims 20-24 distinctly claim the present invention as described in the Specification. Applicant believes the added new claims provide the scope of coverage to which Applicant is entitled. Applicant believes that no basis for further search arises from these amended or new claims. Claims 20-24 extend the limitations of the pending claims to Claims 1-2, 17, 18 and 21. New Claim 24 addresses the functions described in Specification Paragraph 0034. Applicant respectfully requests entry of these new claims into the application and their passage to allowance.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully believes that the present invention is not anticipated by, nor rendered obvious, in light of the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests entry

of the present amendment, favorable consideration of the above remarks, withdrawal of the present rejections, and passage of Claims 1-3, 7-9, 12-13, and 15-24 to allowance. The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "C. Kelley Crossman". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

C. Kelley Crossman
Reg. No. 34,312

CKC/kr
February 15, 2008
LARIVIERE, GRUBMAN & PAYNE, LLP
Post Office Box 3140
Monterey, CA 93942
(831) 649-8800